

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vigninia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 09/765,880 | 01/18/2001 | Gregory P. Crawford | 12136.125 | 9292 | |
| 75 | 90 09/16/2003 | | | | |
| Mary Rose Scozzafava, Esq. Hale and Dorr LLP 60 State Street | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | AKKAPEDDI, PRASAD R | | |
| Boston, MA 02 | 2109 | | | | |
| | | • | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| • | | | 2871 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 09/16/2003 | DATE MAILED: 09/16/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



| . | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | 09/765,880 | CRAWFORD ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Prasad R Akkapeddi | 2871 | V | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears n the c ver sheet with the c | rrespondence ad | ldress | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | y. ommunication. | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 J | <u>lune 2003</u> . | | | | | |
| | is action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowationsed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims | ance except for formal matters, pr Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4 | rosecution as to th 153 O.G. 213. | e merits is | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14 and 32</u> is/are pending in the app | olication. | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw | vn from consideration. | | , | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14 and 32</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | r election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine | | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 18 January 2001 is/are: | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | aminer. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a | a)-(d) or (t). | | | | |
| a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: | | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documents | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents | | | | | | |
| Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bu See the attached detailed Office action for a list | reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | Stage | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti | c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(| e) (to a provisiona | l application). | | | |
| a) The translation of the foreign language pro 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesting | * * | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6 | 4) Interview Summar 5) Notice of Informal . Other: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-14 and 32 in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged. Claims 15-31 and 33-47 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Drawings

2. The drawings filed on 01/18/2001 are acceptable subject to correction of the informalities indicated on the attached "Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review," PTO-948. In order to avoid abandonment of this application, correction is required in reply to the Office action. The correction will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-4, 7-13 and 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sutherland et al. (Sutherland I) (U.S.Patent No. 5,942,157).

As to claims 1 and 32: Sutherland I, discloses a device having electrically controllable, variable reflection gratings (diffraction efficiency, note: diffraction is a form of reflection by a grating) (col. 1, lines 15-25) having a composition comprising a periodic array of liquid crystal disposed in a polymer matrix (PDLC) (col. 5, lines 18-25), the liquid crystal having an index of refraction that is variable in response to an applied electric field, wherein the index of refraction of the

Art Unit: 2871

liquid crystal array and the index of refraction of the polymer matrix, np, are mismatched at first and second applied electric field strength (col. 17, lines 27-61). Sutherland I, discloses the application of external electric field across the ITO electrodes for applying the electric fields (col. 10, lines 15-16) and a means for the application of the electric field (figs. 14-17).

As to claims 2-4: Sutherland I, discloses the application of various electric fields, including a field strength of zero volts (Fig. 4), as recited in instant claim 2, The alignment of the liquid crystal droplets with the electric field is disclosed in Fig. 8b and (col. 9, lines 47-53) and the various reflection wavelengths with the applied electric field is disclosed in Fig. 4.

As to claims 7-13: Sutherland I, discloses that the liquid crystal has a positive and negative dielectric anisotropy (col. 3, lines 41-42), as recited in instant the claims 7 and 8 and the dielectric anisotropy dependence upon applied field frequency is disclosed in (col. 13, lines 60-63), as recited in the instant claim 9. Sutherland I, discloses the application of these reflection gratings in switchable filters (col. 15, line 41), as recited in the instant claim 10. Sutherland I, discloses a power source for the application of the electric field (Figs. 14-17) and the electrodes being ITO that is electrically conductive (col. 7, lines 57-58), as recited in the instant claims 11-13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2871

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutherland I in view of Sutherland et al. (Sutherland II) (Applied Physics Letters 64 (9), 28 February 1994), the Applicant cited disclosure.

Sutherland I, discloses an effective refractive index of the liquid crystal (n sub LC) and a refractive index for the polymer (n sub p) (col. 17, lines 27-30).

However, Sutherland I, does not explicitly state that the liquid crystal has an ordinary (n sub 0) and an extraordinary (n sub e) refractive indices and that the (n sub 0 is not equal to n sub p) and does not disclose that the indices are related by (n sub e > n sub p > n sub 0).

Sutherland II, on the other hand in disclosing electrically switchable volume gratings in polymer-dispersed liquid crystals, discloses that the liquid crystal having and ordinary (n sub 0 = 1.518) and an extraordinary (n sub e = 1.738) indices of refraction and the refractive index of the polymer (n sub e = 1.517) (page 1076). Hence the relationships (n sub 0 is not equal to n sub p) and (n sub e > n sub p > n sub 0) is satisfied, as recited in claims 5 and 6.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the specific indices of refraction for the liquid crystal and the polymer satisfying the indicated relationships to achieve devices with high diffraction efficiencies, as well as narrow band wavelength and angle selectivity (page 1074).

Art Unit: 2871

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutherland I, in view of Catchpole et al. (Catchpole) (U.S.Patent No. 5,644,330).

Sutherland I discloses that the electrode comprises a conductive layer made out of ITO. Sutherland I, however, does not disclose that the electrode is a metallic electrode.

Catchpole, in disclosing a driving method for polymer stabilized liquid crystal displays, discloses that the electrode layer (18) may be a thin layer of metal such as silver, copper, titanium and molybdenum, including a thin layer of transparent conductive material such as Indium tin oxide (col. 3, lines 55-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the thin layer of metal in place of Indium tin oxide, as long as the metal layer is transparent (col. 3, line 54-55) for low energy consumption devices and for effective addressing of large, color displays.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Havens et al. (U.S.Patent No. 5,691,790: discloses a colored reflective liquid crystal display.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prasad R Akkapeddi whose telephone number is 703-305-4767. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM to 5:30PM M-Th.

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 09/765,880

Art Unit: 2871

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H Kim can be reached on 703-305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0530.

September 3, 2003

Primary Examiner